



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,339	08/24/2006	Alexander Jaczyk	TC03B10004	5424
77117 7590 11/18/2010 COVENANT IP CONSULTING CO. P.O. BOX 34-306 TAIPEI CITY TAIPEI, 10499 TAIWAN				
EXAMINER				
DANG, HUNG Q				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2612				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/18/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

IVAN.SU@COVENANT-IP.COM
ivan.e.su@gmail.com
ifool76@gmail.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/596,339

Applicant(s)

JACZYK, ALEXANDER

Examiner

HUNG Q. DANG

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 September 2010.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 23-53 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 37-48 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 23-36 and 49-53 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notes of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the claims' election dated 9/14/2010.

The Applicant has elected, without traverse, to prosecute Species I (claims 23-36 & 49-53). Claims 37-48 have been cancelled.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 28 is objected to because of the following informalities: on line 8th of claim 28, a ";" is suggested to be inserted after "sequences" and a "," is suggested to be inserted after "input" on line 9 for clarification purpose. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. **Claim 51** recites the limitation "**the number of syllables** of the sequence of characters is additionally input and used during the comparison" in claim 49. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

5. **Claim 52** recites the limitation "...for inputting **the number of syllables** to an edge area of the text input area, being provided for inputting **the number of syllables**" in claim 49. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 23-25, 49,50 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ichbiah U.S. Patent 5,623,406.

Regarding claim 23, Ichbiah teaches a communication device comprising:

an input device (figure 2, unit 13) for inputting text character-by-character from a sequence of characters (see column 3, lines 1-9);

a memory device for storing a plurality of reference character sequences of characters (columns 11-12 show glossary tables/format which indicates the existence of a memory device; tables 1-2 show a plurality of reference character sequences of characters); and

a prediction device (figure 2, unit 11) for comparing individual ones of the input characters with the reference character sequences and for proposing at least one of the reference character sequences after the inputting of individual input characters of the sequence of characters to be input provides a corresponding comparison result, wherein the prediction device compares the input characters to characters that are not directly adjacent to the reference character sequences (see column 5 lines 55-60; for example: "didime" is the abbreviation for "Dichlorodifluoromethane". Thus the prediction

device of Ichbiah compares the input characters "didime" to characters that are not directly adjacent to the reference character sequences).

Regarding claim 24, Ichbiah also teaches comparing the input characters with the first and the last character of the reference character sequences (see examples in column 5 lines 30-36; "chrtcs" = "characteristics").

Regarding claim 25, the prediction device of Ichbiah also compares a plurality of input characters with initial and end characters of a plurality of syllables of multi-syllable ones of the reference character sequences (see column 5 lines 55-60; for example: "didime" involves comparison of a plurality of input characters with initial and end characters of a plurality of syllables of a multi-syllable ones of the reference character sequences '*Dichlorodifluoromethane*').

Regarding claim 49, see the rejection of claim 23.

Regarding claim 50, see the rejection of claim 24.

Regarding claim 53, Ichbiah also teaches that the prediction for input characters of the sequence characters is performed after the input of a completion character (see column 5, lines 55-60; the Examiner interprets the last character of a abbreviated sequence inputted by the user is a completion character).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 26, 27 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichbiah U.S. Patent 5,623,406 in view of Buxton et al. U.S. Patent 6,094,197.

Regarding claim 26, the input device disclosed by Ichbiah is also an interactive display device (see figures 1A-B) on which characters are displayed in a text input area (figure 1B, area 111).

However, the characters of the device disclosed by Ichbiah are not touch-sensitively selectable for inputting, and wherein the prediction device distinguishes between touching and drawing movements during an input of characters.

Buxton et al., in the same field of endeavor, teaches a communication device, wherein the input characters are touch-sensitively selectable for inputting, and wherein the prediction device distinguishes between touching and drawing movements during an input of characters (see figures 2-3 and column 4, lines 59-63; *tapping* (= *touching*) on the "a" key results in "a"; An upward stroke on "a" results in "A").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further equip the communication device disclosed by Ichbiah the capability such that the input characters are touch-sensitively and also are selectable for inputting by drawing movements, as evidenced by Buxton et al., to increase the versatility of inputting lower case and upper case characters.

Regarding claim 27, as mentioned above, Ichbiah teaches the communication device as claimed in claim 23, wherein the input device is an interactive display device on which characters are displayed in a text input area and are touch-sensitively selectable for inputting.

However, Ichbiah does not specifically teach *wherein the prediction device uses drawing movement between various characters of the text input area for marking characters*.

Buxton et al., in the same field of endeavor, teaches an interactive input device with a touch sensitive text input area for inputting character, wherein the device uses drawing movement in the text input area for marking characters (For example, see figure 3; if the drawing moment is in the up direction from key "a", a capital A would be entered).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further provide the recited drawing movement capability to the input device of Ichbiah, as suggested by Buxton et al., so that the user would have more flexibility for entering characters in lower case and upper case by applying drawing movement as suggested by Buxton et al.

Regarding claim 52, Buxton et al. also teaches a display device with a touch-sensitive text input area for inputting a character (see figures 2-3 and column 4 lines 59-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further provide a display device with a touch-sensitive text

input area for inputting a character to the device of Ichbiah so that characters can be inputted by the user's touch.

10. Claims 28, 34-36 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichbiah U.S. Patent 5,623,406 in view of Venema U.S. Patent 4,893,238.

Regarding claim 28, as already mentioned above, Ichbiah teaches a communication device, comprising:

an input device for entering text character-by-character from a sequence of characters;

a memory device that stores a plurality of reference character sequences of characters; and

a prediction device that compares individual ones of the input characters with the reference character sequences and for proposing at least one of the reference character sequences after the inputting of individual input characters of the sequence of characters to be input provides a corresponding comparison result.

However, Ichbiah does not specifically teach that *the input device enters a number of syllables with respect to two input characters of the sequence of characters to be input, and wherein the prediction device compares the number of input syllables with corresponding numbers of syllables of the reference character sequences.*

Venema, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a method of inputting text from a sequence of characters, wherein *the input device enters a number of syllables with*

respect to two input characters of the sequence of characters to be input, and wherein the prediction device compares the number of input syllables with corresponding numbers of syllables of the reference character sequences (see column 3, lines 41-55 and column 18 lines 25-30).

Since both inputting methods of Ichbiah and Venema are involved inputting short-cut abbreviations for deriving a complete character sequence and Venema suggests inputting character sequence abbreviations using a number of syllables as recited, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further incorporate the inputting method of Venema, which involves the inputting and comparison of input syllables with corresponding numbers of syllables of the reference character sequences, to the input device of Ichbiah, so that the user would have more flexibility and abbreviations in entering words that involves a plurality of syllables.

Regarding claim 34, Ichbiah also teaches that the syllable input area extends over two opposite edge areas of the text input area and extends further along the laterally adjoining edge areas from the outside edge sections (see figures 1A-B; the laterally joining edge areas are shown in figures 1A-B).

Regarding claim 35, Ichbiah also teaches that the input device inputs a word completion character for identifying the end of a word (see column 5, lines 55-60; the Examiner interprets the last character of a abbreviated sequence inputted by the user is a completion character).

Regarding claim 36, Ichbiah also teaches that the reference character sequence is stored as a sentence or part of a sentence of a plurality of words and is provided for comparing and predicting a sentence or part of a sentence (see column 6, lines 25-31).

Regarding claim 51, Ichbiah teaches the method as claimed in claim 49. However, Ichbiah does not specifically teach that wherein the number of syllables of the sequence of characters is additionally input and used during the comparison.

Venema, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a method of inputting text from a sequence of characters, which employs inputting a number of syllables of a sequence of characters and it is used during comparison (see column 3, lines 41-55 and column 18 lines 25-30).

Since both inputting methods of Ichbiah and Venema are involved inputting short-cut abbreviations for deriving a complete character sequence and Venema suggests using a number of syllables of a sequence of characters for comparison with reference character sequence.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further incorporate the inputting method of Venema, which involves the inputting and comparison of input syllables, to the inputting method of Ichbiah, so that the user would have more flexibility and abbreviations in entering words that involves a plurality of syllables.

11. Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichbiah U.S. Patent 5,623,406 in view of Venema U.S. Patent 4,893,238, as rejected in claim 28, and in further view of Buxton et al. U.S. Patent 6,094,197.

Regarding claim 32, as mentioned above, Ichbiah in view of Venema teaches the communication device of claim 28, wherein the input device is an interactive display device on which characters are displayed in a text input area.

However, ichbiah in view of Venema does not specifically teach that *the input device is touch-sensitively selectable for inputting, and wherein the prediction device distinguishes between touching and drawing movements during an input of characters.*

Buxton et al., in the same field of endeavor, teaches an interactive input device with a touch sensitive text input area for inputting character, *the input device is touch-sensitively selectable for inputting, and wherein the prediction device distinguishes between touching and drawing movements during an input of characters* (For example, see figure 3; if the drawing moment is in the up direction from key "a", a capital A would be entered).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further provide the recited touching/drawing movement capability to the input device of Ichbiah in view of Venema, as suggested by Buxton et al., so that the user would have more flexibility for entering characters in lower case and upper case by applying drawing movement as suggested by Buxton et al.

Regarding claim 33, as mentioned above, Ichbiah teaches the communication device as claimed in claim 28, wherein the input device is an interactive display device on which characters are displayed in a text input area and are touch-sensitively selectable for inputting.

However, Ichbiah in view of Venema does not specifically teach *wherein the prediction device uses drawing movement between various characters of the text input area for marking characters*.

Buxton et al., in the same field of endeavor, teaches an interactive input device with a touch sensitive text input area for inputting character, wherein the device uses drawing movement in the text input area for marking characters (For example, see figure 3; if the drawing moment is in the up direction from key "a", a capital A would be entered).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further provide the recited drawing movement capability to the input device of Ichbiah in view of Venema, as suggested by Buxton et al., so that the user would have more flexibility for entering characters in lower case and upper case by applying drawing movement as suggested by Buxton et al.

12. Closely related prior arts but not applicable for art rejections: U.S. Patents 7,656,314; 5,457,454; 2005/0088415; 2006/0007162.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG Q. DANG whose telephone number is (571)272-3069. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Zimmerman can be reached on (571) 272-3059. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hung Q Dang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2612
11/10/2010

/Brian A Zimmerman/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2612